

Large marine protected areas (LMPAs) in the Mediterranean Sea: the opportunity of the Adriatic Sea

Azzurra Bastari^a, Fiorenza Micheli^b, Francesco Ferretti^b, Antonio Pusceddu^c, and Carlo Cerrano^a

^a Dipartimento di Scienze della Vita e dell'Ambiente, Università Politecnica delle Marche, Ancona, 60131, Italy

^b Hopkins Marine Station, Stanford University, Pacific Grove, CA 93950, USA

^c Dipartimento di Scienze della Vita e dell'Ambiente Università degli Studi di Cagliari, 09126 Cagliari, Italy

Corresponding author: A. Bastari Email: azzubast@mta01.univpm.it

The published journal article is available here:

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2016.03.010>

© 2016 Licensed under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Large marine protected areas (LMPAs) in the Mediterranean Sea: the opportunity of the Adriatic Sea

Azzurra Bastari ^a, Fiorenza Micheli ^b, Francesco Ferretti ^b, Antonio Pusceddu^c, and Carlo Cerrano ^a

^a Dipartimento di Scienze della Vita e dell'Ambiente, Università Politecnica delle Marche, Ancona, 60131, Italy

^b Hopkins Marine Station, Stanford University, Pacific Grove, CA 93950, USA

^c Dipartimento di Scienze della Vita e dell'Ambiente, Università degli Studi di Cagliari, 09126 Cagliari, Italy

Corresponding author: A. Bastari Email: azzubast@mta01.univpm.it

Highlights

- Large Marine Protected Areas can be a conservation tool for the Mediterranean Sea
- The Adriatic Sea is a top priority for the establishment of a Mediterranean LMPA
- An Adriatic LMPA can trigger ecological, socio-economic and political benefits
- An Adriatic LMPA may built a best practice for other intensely-used marine regions

1. Introduction

In recent years numerous international conventions have recognised the need to increase protection of marine resources and to reform ocean management to balance the multitude of human marine uses. Significant efforts are taking place worldwide to reach the objective of protecting 10% of coastal and marine areas by 2020 (Aichi targets Convention for Biological Diversity (CBD) (<https://www.cbd.int/2011-2020/goals/>)). Very recently, some initiatives have been planned to expand ocean protection to deep and offshore areas (including Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ) or high seas; see Glossary) [1–3].

Progress towards the 10% target has accelerated in recent years through the establishment of several Large Marine Protected Areas (LMPAs, 1000s-10,000s Km² in surface area) and very LMPAs (VLMPAs, > 100,000 Km²) ([4]; see Glossary, Fig. 1 and Table S1 in Suppl. materials). LMPAs and VLMPAs provide unique benefits, but also potential drawbacks and challenges, including the difficulty of limiting uses and of enforcing regulations over large areas of the ocean, particularly in intensely-used marine regions (Table 1).

The Mediterranean Sea is a prime example of the difficulty of establishing comprehensive, coordinated marine conservation and management. The Mediterranean has been exploited for centuries and currently is one of the most intensely-used and most impacted seas in the world [5,6]. Marine resource overexploitation poses major threats to biodiversity, resulting in the decline and loss of marine populations and habitats [7,8]. In turn, the consequences of biodiversity loss include decline in ecosystem function and flow of ecosystem services [9], a scenario that is complicated by climate change [10,11].

Mediterranean marine ecosystems are composed by diverse and ecologically valuable habitats such as seamounts, canyons, hydrothermal vents, cold seeps, mud volcanoes and unique and sensitive habitats (e.g. meadows of the endemic seagrass *Posidonia oceanica* and biogenic reefs) [12]. These habitats make the Mediterranean Sea one of world seas with the highest biodiversity [13,14]. Although the basin covers only 0.82% of the global ocean’s surface, it hosts more than 17,000 described marine species, contributing to an estimated 4% – 18% of the world’s marine biodiversity [15,16]. These values are likely much higher if the hidden deep-sea biodiversity is included [13]. More than 20% of known Mediterranean marine species are endemic [17], and therefore at risk of global extinction from local extirpation.

As of 2012, 161 marine protected areas (MPAs) have been established in the Mediterranean, covering 4.6% of its surface [18] (Fig. 1). Most MPAs are small (66% of Mediterranean MPAs are smaller than 50 Km²; [18,19]) and concentrated along its northern and western coasts. The only Mediterranean LMPA is the Pelagos Sanctuary for Marine Mammals, which encompasses 87,500 Km² [6,20] (Fig. 1) and accounts for 76% of the Mediterranean total protected area (3.5% of the total Mediterranean MPAs surface; [5]). If Pelagos is excluded, only 1% of the Mediterranean Sea surface is in MPAs, and less than 0.1% is in fully protected areas that exclude all extractive uses [1,17]. Thus, it is necessary to increase conservation efforts throughout the Mediterranean basin to reach the CBD protection target of 10% in MPAs by 2020 and achieve more effective protection of marine biodiversity and management of multiple marine uses. This goal could be achieved through the establishment of LMPAs.

Among the Mediterranean ecoregions, the Adriatic Sea represents a top priority and opportunity for expanding spatial protection through MPAs [6]. This region has undergone major fisheries overexploitation, causing the widespread degradation of marine habitats, decline of target and non-target species, food-web alterations [7,21–24], and major losses of ecosystem services [25]. The yields of several important commercial fisheries have sharply declined in the last 6–7 decades [26–28]. The basin-scale management of the Adriatic Sea and its resources is challenging because of the presence of a large array of multiple interacting pressures, in addition to fishing [56]. Moreover, marine resource management and ecosystem restoration are also complicated by the exceptional proximity of the various countries bordering the Adriatic Sea, each with their own economic interests and cultural and legal approaches to marine management.

Recognition of these peculiar environmental and geo-political constraints has motivated the development of the European Strategy for the Adriatic Ionian Macroregion (EUSAIR) (<http://www.ai-macroregion.eu/>), whose objective is to increase cooperation among the countries bordering the Adriatic Sea. The initiative is built upon four main pillars (Table 2), including the quality of marine environment, in line with the ecosystem approach of the CBD. The Adriatic Ionian Macroregion initiative could represent a political opportunity for the establishment of a transboundary LMPA, in particular a no-trawl area aimed at recovering biodiversity and reversing fisheries decline in the Adriatic Sea. An Adriatic

1 LMPA could promote biological and socioeconomic benefits and effectively address the
2 political and management challenges of large-scale protection of the basin, as reported
3 from other areas of the world's oceans (Table 1).
4
5
6

7
8 This work presents the rationale for, as well as the risks and uncertainties of, establishing
9 a transboundary LMPA in the Adriatic Sea as an option to meet international conservation
10 targets and promote recovery of depleted fish stocks and habitats. First, the ecological
11 basis for such an initiative, by assessing key ecosystem services (with a focus on
12 fisheries) that are expected to benefit from the establishment of an Adriatic LMPA it is
13 analysed. Then, the political opportunities and the national and international legal
14 frameworks that may enable the establishment of a LMPA in the Adriatic Sea it is
15 examined. Finally, a possible process by which the LMPA may be implement and identify
16 the remaining challenges, information gaps and uncertainties of this proposed process it is
17 delineated.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 (Fig. 1. Here)
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(Table 1. here)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(Table 2. here)

2. The Adriatic Sea: needs and opportunities for large-scale protection

2.1 Marine biodiversity and economies under threat

The Adriatic Sea (Fig. 2) covers 5% (138,600 Km²) of the total area of the Mediterranean and 1% (35,000 km³) of its total volume. It is one of the most productive areas of the Mediterranean Sea, supporting a wide diversity of habitats, including rocky and extensive soft bottoms, large estuaries and lagoons, seagrass meadows, and deep water environments [50–52]. This richness of habitats is mirrored by a high level of biodiversity, with high species richness of marine invertebrates, seabirds, marine mammals [5,7], and 18% of the endemic fish species of the Mediterranean [16,24,53].

The peculiar geomorphology of Adriatic seafloor in its northern and central area has historically created favourable conditions for intense exploitation, providing easy access to fishing ground. The Adriatic Sea has been exploited for centuries by a variety of fishing activities, ranging from small-scale artisanal fisheries and recreational fishing, to industrial fisheries using hydraulic and trawled dredges for clams and scallops, otter and mid-water trawling for exploiting ground and small pelagic fishes, and pelagic long-lines for tunas [7,26,54–56]. In 2013, there were 3,590 trawlers (dredges, demersal and beam trawlers) fishing in the Adriatic. Of these, 3,105 were Italian, while 485 (mainly smaller than 12 m) where from Slovenia and Croatia (<http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/data-reports>). Adriatic fisheries account for 51% of the total capture fish production (landings) in Italy, and 40% of its total value [57]. The main exploited stocks by the Italian fleet are small pelagics such as anchovy (*Engraulis encrasicolus*) and sardine (*Sardina pilchardus*) respectively contributing to 22% and 10% of Italian total landings. European hake (*Merluccius merluccius*) and red mullet (*Mullus barbatus*) are the most important demersal species fished, and together with Norway lobster (*Nephrops norvegicus*), are the next most landed species (together they represent around 4-5% of total landings) [58].

The Adriatic marine ecosystems and the services they provide are affected by a suite of natural and anthropogenic threats [5,59], which have resulted in historical species declines, food web changes, extensive ecosystem degradation, and, more recently, severe regime shifts [7,21,23,25,60–62]. Among all human activities and pressures, fisheries

1 exploitation, in particularly bottom trawling and dredging, has been identified as the major
2 threat [8,59,63]. Impacts of fishing are compounded and exacerbated by other stressors
3 and pressures. Eutrophication, for example, is an important stressor in the north and
4 western Adriatic sectors, which are influenced by high nutrient discharge from the Po River
5 (the Po River, 673 km long, is the 3rd largest Italian freshwater riverine input throughout the
6 Mediterranean Sea and supplies over the 28% into the entire Adriatic Sea and 50% into its
7 northern part [64]). Nutrient input combined with alteration in water circulation have caused
8 hypoxia and anoxia events, resulting in episodic mortalities of the Adriatic benthos
9 [62,65,66]. Maritime traffic is also very intense inside the Adriatic basin, causing a
10 significant risk of accidents and spills of oil and other contaminants [67,68]. From 1990 to
11 2013, the commercial marine traffic of the north Adriatic ports (Koper, Trieste, Venice,
12 Ravenna and Rijeka), increased with an average of 7% per year [69] with a total
13 throughput cargo of 106 million of tonnes in 2014 ([http://www.portsofnapa.com/about-](http://www.portsofnapa.com/about-napa)
14 [napa](http://www.portsofnapa.com/about-napa)). Collective tonnage passing through the Adriatic ports is expected to increase by
15 227% by 2030 [70]. In ten years, since 2002, Mediterranean cruise tourism increased by
16 162%, and Venice and Dubrovnik in the Adriatic Sea were prime destination. The mass
17 tourism related with large ship cruises (more than 4000 passengers and crew), may
18 determine heavy environmental impacts, in particular in a region where effective
19 environmental monitoring and management system for pollution are poor [71]. As a
20 consequence, considering the expected increase in maritime traffics, container traffic, new
21 touristic routes in the Adriatic Sea, an effective integrated coastal zone management
22 (ICZM) is urgent [72]. In this regard, Croatia is currently the unique Adriatic country with an
23 existing legislation for coastal protection, while the ICZM implementation by Slovenia and
24 Italy is in progress [72]. Finally, climate change is also expected to significantly affect
25 these ecosystems [7,73]. The Adriatic Sea counts more than 190 non-indigenous species
26 [74]. In the Italian northern Adriatic 51 invasive species (39 of which in the Lagoon of
27 Venice) have been recorded since 1945 [75], while 61 alien species (due to aquaculture
28 activities and shipping) and 52 introduced (due to climate change) were recorded in
29 Croatian waters [76]. Some invasive species, such as the green grape algae *Caulerpa*
30 *cylindracea* and the red algae *Womersleyella setacea*, are known as habitat modifiers,
31 reducing diversity and changing community structure in invaded areas compared to non-
32 invaded sites [77]. The introduction of non-indigenous and invasive species carried by
33 human vectors (mainly maritime traffic and aquaculture), together with the natural shifts of
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

marine habitats caused by global environmental changes contribute to the modification of marine ecosystems.

2.2 Existing MPAs and other forms of spatial marine management

Currently, there are 25 coastal MPAs (including all coastal protected areas with a marine component, Table S2 in Suppl. materials) in the Adriatic Sea, altogether covering less than 1% of its surface. Four additional MPAs are planned: two in Albania (Kepi i Rodonit and Porto Palermo) [67], and two in central Italy (Costa del Monte Conero and Costa del Piceno) [72].

The current siting of Adriatic MPAs is not homogeneously distributed: 21 of the 25 existing MPAs are along the eastern coast of the basin, 17 of these in Croatia (though only six of these are managed MPAs [72]) (Fig. 2). Adriatic MPAs are also widely heterogeneous in their regime of legal protection. There are national parks (Briuni, Croatia), nature reserves (Miramare, Italy) and natural monuments (Debeli Rtic, Slovenia) (see the Glossary for their definitions).

(Fig.2. here)

Outside of the 12 nautical miles limit of national territorial waters, there is no permanent spatial protection and management of human activities. Current, management of Adriatic trawl fisheries calls for temporal closures (i.e. closing sectors to fishing for a few months, seasons or years; Tremiti Island, Tenue areas, Miramare, area off Ravenna, the area around the Barbara gas platform, a no-trawl area off Apulia region, and the Jabuka-Pomo Pit [79] are examples of existing temporal closures within the Adriatic, see below). Seasonal closures (e.g. for 30-45 days, as commonly done in Italy) are likely too short to recover demersal and benthic species with long-term life cycles [78]. The Croatian fleet operating on offshore areas is mainly composed by large pelagic purse-seines, particular involved in Bluefin tuna fishery [79]. In Croatia, temporal closures of purse-seine fisheries go from December 1st (with interruption between December 14th and 24th) to January 31st throughout the national territorial waters. With the ordinance on spatial and temporal closures regarding purse-seine fisheries in 2015, the temporal restriction covers also the month of May for the objective to protect anchovy during its spawning period [80].

Fouzai et al. [24] modelled the efficacy of different fisheries' management strategies applied in the Adriatic from 1975 to 2020, including the limitation of the number of fishing licenses, the introduction of closed fishing seasons, the establishment of spatial and temporal closures for all or a subset of fishing gears (e.g. seasonal closure of mid-water and bottom trawl fisheries; see the Glossary for the definitions of these fisheries). Their results demonstrate that past fisheries management has not been effective in ensuring a sustainable use of marine resources, and that the current management regime is not expected to promote recovery of depleted fish stocks unless is augmented with new options, including the establishment of MPAs and an overall reduction of fishing effort [24].

Areas outside territorial waters include important and sensitive fishery areas [81,82]. The Jabuka-Pomo Pit (240 m of maximum depth), for example, is considered a nursery area for some of the most economically important fished Adriatic species, such as the European hake, *Merluccius merluccius*, and the Norway lobster *Nephrops norvegicus* [83–85], and consequently this area is regularly and intensively trawled [86]. Due to the importance of this area, there is an ongoing debate on the need to establish here a permanent no-trawl area [82,87]. In July 26th 2015, a temporary no-trawl area covering approx. 2,700 Km² was established in the international waters of the Jabuka-Pomo Pit to promote the recovery of *M. merluccius* and *N. norvegicus* [88] (Fig. 2). The closure is planned for only one year and it includes a fraction of the nursery and spawning areas identified for these and other commercially important species [85].

3. Ecological, economic and political benefits of no-trawl areas

3.1 Benefits for target stocks, non-target species, and fisheries

Empirical assessments of the effects of large no-trawl zones from other marine regions, particularly the few established in intensely exploited regions, are valuable references for anticipating the benefits of establishing no-trawl zone in the Adriatic (Table 3). Several studies report evidence that limiting or banning bottom trawling from large areas can provide some of the positive economic and biological effects expected for LMPAs (Table 1), as well as additional benefits specific to benthic and demersal communities. In particular, no-trawl zones are expected to promote recovery of depleted target populations and benefit adjacent fishing grounds and fisheries through larval, juvenile and adult spillover. In addition, no-trawl zones are expected to increase diversity of benthic and

demersal assemblages, and increase complexity of benthic habitats, thereby restoring processes and interactions lost in intensely fished marine ecosystems [89–91]. A trawl-ban will also reduce by-catch of marine megafauna. Research has linked trawl fishing with sea turtle strandings [92,93]. It is estimated that more than 132,000 turtles are incidentally caught annually by Mediterranean fisheries and more than 4,000 are taken in the north Adriatic [94,95]. Similar figures have been recorded for cetaceans [53].

In the Gulf of Castellammare, a previously intensely-bottom trawled area off Sicily [96], a significant increase in catch of eleven target species (9 finfish and 2 cephalopods) was reported after only a 4-years trawl ban covering approximately 200 Km² (corresponding to about 50% of the total surface area of the gulf). Artisanal and recreational fishing are allowed inside the gulf, while all towed bottom and pelagic fishing gears are forbidden. The trawl ban promoted recovery of benthic habitats and increased habitat complexity. Areas with no bottom trawling show structured three-dimensional benthic communities [97] with higher diversity and density of invertebrates (e.g. sponges and seapens) than heavily trawled grounds [98,99]. The recovery of large epifauna, such as sponges, hydroids, bryozoan and tube-dwelling polychaetes in undisturbed areas results in complex biogenic habitats that provide refuges and food to benthic and neritic species, including larval and juvenile stages that are key to the recovery of over-exploited species [100]. Similar positive effects on benthic diversity and habitat complexity were observed at lightly or no- bottom trawled areas of eastern Florida, USA (Table 3). Demersal and pelagic species are linked to benthic assemblages, exploiting them both as food source, as refuge and/or reproduction/nursery areas [101], highlighting the importance of an ecosystem approach to the management of fisheries, including the protection of habitats and food-web interactions.

The fishing closures on Georges Bank, USA, are other clear examples of the beneficial effects of large no-trawl areas. The Georges Bank is a shallow, mainly sandy submarine plateau with high level of primary productivity that has been one of the most important fishing grounds of the North West Atlantic. The increase of fishing effort since 1960 caused the decline of over 50% of total fish biomass [102]. After the collapse of cod stocks in the 1990s, five large areas, together covering 22,000 Km², were closed year-round to all gears targeting groundfish, including bottom trawlers and scallop dredges [103]. Monitoring of these no-trawl areas highlighted the importance of long-term spatial closures for meeting the multiple management objectives of recovering depleted fisheries, protecting benthic habitats, and restoring ecosystem structure and function. Protection of

1 spawning stocks and juvenile haddock and cod has contributed to increase the abundance
2 of these populations [32,102]. Scientific trawl surveys demonstrated that in four years
3 since the closure (between 1994 and 1998), scallop total biomass and harvestable
4 biomass increased by a factor of 14 and 15 respectively in the closed areas, and catches
5 outside the closure boundaries increased through larval spillover from the no-trawl zones
6 [32].
7
8
9

10
11 In addition to examples of recovery of individual size and abundance of fished stocks
12 within the no/lightly trawled areas, and increased catches in adjacent fishing grounds, trawl
13 bans can results in economic benefits through increased value of the catch (Table 3). In
14 the Gulf of Castellammare no-trawl area, fishes reached larger sizes compared to adjacent
15 fished areas, resulting in greater commercial value and increased reproductive output
16 [104,105]. Increased catch of high value species, such as scallop, shrimp and crab has
17 resulted in an increase of income for the Georges Banks fisheries [32,106]. Benefits can
18 extend to other sectors and users groups. The absence of competition from trawling inside
19 the Gulf of Castellammare, for example, ensured a sustainable artisanal fishery, which
20 benefited from the increase of fish stocks promoted by the trawl ban [107].
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Spatial gradients in fishing pressure across the Adriatic basin provide an opportunity to
31 examine the past and current impacts of trawling and make predictions about the possible
32 future effects of its spatial management in areas that are currently intensely fished [23].
33 Along the western (Italian) Adriatic coasts, fishing effort has historically been greater
34 whereas along the eastern (Croatian) side, fisheries have developed more slowly and in a
35 less industrialized fashion. As an effect of this historical fishing pressure, in the last 60
36 years catch rates and landings of elasmobranchs have declined by >94% and 80-89%
37 respectively in the central and northern Adriatic Sea [23,108]. However, these declines
38 were not homogeneous throughout the basin. Comparing catch rates between the two
39 sides of the basin, Ferretti et al. (2013) found that a greater species richness and
40 abundance of sharks and rays persisted on the eastern side of the Adriatic, reflecting the
41 less intense fishing pressure on the Croatian side both historically and recently. Thus, the
42 Croatian jurisdictional waters acted as a refuge from intense fishing pressure. Data also
43 indicate that mobile species like spurdogs, eagle rays and smooth-hounds that maintained
44 higher abundances on the eastern side may have replenished the more intensely exploited
45 western side and supported catches within this region [23].
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(Table 3. here)

3.2 Expected benefits for ecosystem functions and services

Recovery of marine ecosystems from trawling impacts may provide additional benefits, beyond fisheries. The importance of soft bottom habitats, the most widespread bottom type in the Adriatic, is increasingly recognised [114]. Soft bottom benthos play important ecosystem functions such as controlling eutrophication and algal blooms by filtering large water volumes and stabilizing sediments [115–118]. Soft-bottom macrofauna can have profound influences on organic matter deposited on marine sediments [119]. Large-bodied species, such as sea urchins, influence sediment biogeochemistry through their burrowing activity [116]. Bioturbation, the disturbance of sedimentary deposits by living organisms, has a major influence on column fluxes of nutrients and oxygen between sediments and the water column by increasing nutrient remineralization [114,116].

Benthic filter feeders improve water quality through water filtration. They are involved in benthic-pelagic coupling, the cycling of nutrients between sediments and the overlaying water column [120], nutrient regeneration [117], and facilitation of surrounding communities by providing refuges from predation [121]. Bivalve filtration, in particular, can have a fundamental role in controlling phytoplankton communities and water quality. The filtering activity of bivalves and other filter feeders can control phytoplankton abundance, reducing algal blooms and consequent anoxic or hypoxic events [122]. For example, it was calculated that in oyster beds of Chesapeake Bay, USA, around 188,000 tons (dry tissue) of the oyster *Crassostrea virginica* would filter the whole water volume of the bay (around $70 \times 10^9 \text{ m}^3$) in less than 1 week. The depletion of these oyster populations and reefs that have occurred from the beginning of 19th century has caused an estimated 50-fold decrease in filtering activity [115,122]. These results raise the question of whether the once abundant population of filters feeders in the Adriatic may have similarly contributed to maintain its water quality.

The recent dramatic reduction in the Adriatic Sea of filter feeding organisms, such as clams [28], oysters [123], and sponges [124] due to intense fishing, habitat loss from bottom trawling, dredging, hypoxia, and climate change may have produced a functional

loss similar to that documented in Chesapeake Bay. The disappearance or decrease of ecologically important filter feeders may in turn have led to dramatic ecosystem shifts [125], e.g. favouring the outbreaks of gelatinous plankton that impacts the communities in the water column by removing zooplankton and fish larvae [125]. The overexploitation of the north Adriatic *Ostrea edulis* reefs, whose landings decreased from ca. 57 t in 2002 to 1.5 t in 2012 [56], eventually caused their local extinction [126] and the consequent loss of their filtration efficiency in the basin, ultimately resulting in an ecological extinction (i.e., loss of their ecological function [127]). This decline, however, may be the tail end of a much larger historical reduction of any oyster species in the region. Lotze et al. (2006), estimated a reduction of oysters of around 90% since Roman time [128].

Another bivalve that is currently present and harvested in the Adriatic is the clam *Chamelea gallina*. Based on laboratory estimates, the filtration rate of *C. gallina* is 0.42 L h⁻¹ [129] (a lower value than those measured for *Ostrea edulis* - 2.83 L h⁻¹ g⁻¹ [130] - and sponges - 1 - 6 L h⁻¹ [131]). It is estimated that to filter the entire Adriatic water volume, the currently depleted population of *C. gallina* would take 7 years longer than the clam population present in the 1950s (Bastari, unpublished data). Bottom trawling and dredging have radically altered many epibenthic communities of the central and northern Adriatic Sea [132]. The consequences of this change in terms of filtration capacity have never been considered, but are expected to be important. Field and laboratory measurements, modelling, and historical reconstructions of ecosystem change are needed to assess and quantify changes in ecosystem function and services due to bottom trawling, and make predictions about what might be recovered in LMPAs. While LMPAs regulating fisheries alone cannot directly address additional pressures (such as climate changes, marine pollution), they are expected to increase population and ecosystem resilience to global change by decreasing cumulative impacts and recovering diversity and functional redundancy [133–135].

3.3 Expected economic and political benefits

A suite of marine sectors supports the marine economies of the Adriatic region. The most valuable sectors include coastal and maritime tourism (8 billion euros), transport (5.2 billion euros), fisheries (2.9 billion euros), offshore oil and gas activities (2.2 billion euros), ship building and repair (1.5 billion euros) and, finally aquaculture (0.3 billion euros in 2012). In terms of employment, tourism (198,760 jobs) is the most important sector,

1 followed by fisheries (95,420 jobs), transport (55,860 jobs), shipbuilding and repair (48,610
2 jobs), offshore oil and gas (5,970 jobs) and aquaculture (4,030 jobs) [136].
3

4 The Adriatic region is one of the most visited sectors of the Mediterranean for tourism. In
5 Italy, Adriatic tourism is worth almost 2.5 times the value generated by fisheries [136]. The
6 environmental status of the sea is one of the most important factors influencing tourists'
7 choices to vacation in Croatia [137]. A transboundary Adriatic LMPA could thus provide
8 new opportunities to bolster this economic sector. An example could be well-regulated
9 fishing activities where tourists can conduct a limited amount of fishing within the protected
10 area for immediate consumption (charter fishing trips) with economic benefits and job
11 opportunities for coastal communities in all neighbouring countries (transportation,
12 accommodations, meals) [138,139]. In California, USA, recreational fishing within the four
13 marine sanctuaries of the state generated more than \$200 million in annual economic
14 output and supported nearly 1400 jobs ([http://sanctuaries.noaa.gov/news/press/2015/rec-
15 fishing-california.html](http://sanctuaries.noaa.gov/news/press/2015/rec-fishing-california.html)). Marine mammals, such as dolphins, whales, seals, as well as sea
16 turtles and sharks, were abundant in the Adriatic basin in the past [7,23]. A no-trawl zone,
17 could promote recovery of these species, which are important attractions for tourists
18 interested in nature-related activities. It has been calculated that more than \$300 millions
19 per year are being spent by shark-watchers, supporting 10,000 jobs [140]. The whale
20 watching industry is now a billion dollar business. The current global estimates are of over
21 2.5 billion USD in yearly revenue with the production of around 19,000 jobs around the
22 world [141].
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 There are also potential political benefits derived from the creation of a shared no-trawl
41 area [41,142]. A transboundary no-trawl area is expected to produce international
42 cooperation between bordering countries, and may simplify the definition of their maritime
43 boundaries (Table 1). A clear delimitation of marine regions will define responsibilities of
44 each country in the management and surveillance of their areas of jurisdiction [142].
45 LMPAs in general could act as 'peace parks' [45] and create an important dialogue
46 between states [41].
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 The third pillar of the Adriatic Ionian Macroregion EU Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian
54 Region (EUSAIR) focuses on environmental quality. One of the main goals is to reach a
55 good environmental and ecological status of marine ecosystems, as also requested by the
56 Marine Strategy Framework Directive (2008/56/EC). A transboundary no-trawl area would
57 help to tackle the following ecological targets of Good Environmental Status (GES): (i) the
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 maintenance of sea-floor integrity, by restoring benthic communities and preserving
2 sensitive species and their ecological functions (Descriptor 6, MSFD); (ii) the maintenance
3 of biological diversity, through the protection of the habitats and species of the sandy
4 bottoms (Descriptor 1, MSFD); (iii) ensure the long-term abundance of species and all the
5 food webs elements (Descriptor 4, MSFD). The establishment of a no-trawl zone, with a
6 reduction of fishing effort on a big area of the Adriatic basin, may also contribute to the
7 reduction of the chronic exposure of marine organisms to marine litter (Descriptor 10,
8 MSFD) and ambient noise (Descriptor 11, MSFD).
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 **4. Political opportunities and legal mechanisms for establishing a transboundary** 19 **no-trawl area in the Adriatic Sea** 20 21

22 There are historical precedents, current political opportunities and legal instruments for
23 establishing a transboundary LMPA in the Adriatic Sea. In 2003, Croatia proposed the
24 establishment of a 23,870 Km² Ecological and Fisheries Protection Zone (EFPZ) for
25 marine biodiversity and fisheries conservation [143]. The EFPZ was approved by the
26 Croatian government and enforced in January 2008. However, due to harsh opposition by
27 Italy and Slovenia, fisheries restrictions within this area were applied only to non-European
28 fleets [144]. In 2013, Croatia became a new member of the European Union. This
29 membership has produced new opportunities to start negotiations for the establishment of
30 an Adriatic transboundary LMPA between the two main Adriatic countries (Italy and
31 Croatia) that could co-manage the area. The former European Commission's President
32 Jose' Manuel Barroso has declared that the EU is willing to consider a special protection
33 zone in the middle of the Adriatic [143], thereby demonstrating the Commission's intention
34 to expand marine protection in this region. The EU is also currently funding a plethora of
35 scientific projects on spatial planning within the Adriatic Sea [145–149], further highlighting
36 the EU current effort to support spatial management aimed at promoting the recovery of
37 Adriatic marine resources and economic sectors, and reduce conflicts among user groups.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Despite difficulties in international dialogue and possible stakeholder conflicts (Table 1),
53 international laws provide the legal authority and support for establishing a transboundary
54 LMPA in the Adriatic Sea that would protect its ecosystems and marine resources from
55 bottom trawling, the main driver of their degradation [7,23,59]. The Convention for the
56 Protection of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean (the
57 Barcelona Convention), adopted in 1995 by all Mediterranean States, mandates the
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 selection of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance (SPAMIs) by each
2 nation. In addition, more recently a list of Ecologically or Biologically Significant Marine
3 Areas (EBSAs), including several of the existing SPAMIs, was identified and approved at
4 the Extraordinary Meeting of the Focal Points for Specially Protected Areas
5 (UNEP(DEPI)MED WG. 348/5 June 2010). In 2012, the Contracting Parties of the CBD
6 have been asked by UNEP/MAP to present the work carried out for the identification of the
7 Mediterranean EBSAs. The description of the proposed EBSAs was produced during a
8 workshop hosted in Spain from 7 to 11 April 2014 [150]. The scientific criteria for the
9 identification of the EBSAs, defined by the ninth Conference of the Parties to the CBD, are
10 based on areas' uniqueness or rarity, special importance for life-history stages of species,
11 importance for threatened, endangered or declining species and/or habitats, vulnerability,
12 fragility, sensibility or slow recovery potential, biological productivity, biological diversity
13 and naturalness [151]. The definition of the EBSAs has led to the identification of areas in
14 offshore pelagic and deep-sea habitats in need of protection that are not included in
15 established MPAs. The EBSAs have been endorsed by all the contracting parties of the
16 Barcelona Convention [152].

17
18 In the Adriatic Sea, EBSAs have been identified in the northern, central and southern
19 basins (Fig. 3), making these areas priorities for improved marine management and
20 conservation [150]. The EBSA in the northern Adriatic basin, encompassing the area
21 above the straight line linking Ancona (Italy) and the island of Ilovik (Croatia), was selected
22 because of its high productivity, richness of benthic habitats, and the presence of breeding
23 or feeding areas for dolphin and turtle populations. The central area encompasses the
24 Jabuka-Pomo Pit, but it is larger than the temporary no-trawl zone established in the
25 Jabuka-Pomo Pit in July 2015 (see above). Finally, the southern Adriatic-Ionian EBSA
26 comprises particular features such as cold-water corals and sponge gardens [52,153,154].

27
28 Adriatic areas outside of the current EBSAs were identified as priorities for conservation by
29 a suite of analyses and conservation plans [6,53]. Selection was based on information on
30 the distribution of critical benthic habitats, importance to marine mammals and seabirds,
31 and current distribution and intensity of threats to these ecosystem components [5].
32 Depending on the specific goals, data, and approaches, different areas were selected as
33 top priorities, though areas within the central Adriatic emerge as priorities in most plans [5].
34 Systematic analyses, e.g. utilizing GIS approaches and MPA site selection algorithms, are
35 needed to objectively and transparently identify candidate areas for the establishment of
36 one or multiple no-trawl areas in the Adriatic, addressing and balancing different objectives

and goals. The priority areas should include the protection of nursery habitats for demersal fish species, spawning areas for small pelagic, biogenic habitats, such as sponge and hydroid beds that support high biodiversity and important ecosystem functions, and foraging areas for marine mammals, sea turtles and birds. The large amounts of data available for this region and numerous previous threat analyses and conservation planning exercises [6,59,85,87,147,155] provide a unique opportunity to inform the siting and configuration of a no-trawl area with sound scientific information.

Organizations such as the International Maritime Organization (IMO), or the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) have specific mandates to regulate human uses of deep or offshore habitats, selected through the EBSAs process or independently, by NGOs or other stakeholders. In particular, the GFCM has the authority to adopt spatial management measures to effectively manage fisheries. In this role, GFCM has already declared four Fishery Restricted Areas (FRAs) covering a total area of 26,248 Km² or 0.15% of the Mediterranean Sea surface: the *Lophelia* reef off Capo Santa Maria di Leuca; the Nile delta area; the Eratosthenes Seamount; the Gulf of Lion. In these areas, the use of towed dredges and bottom trawl nets is prohibited. Following the GFCM's FRA protocol, a LMPA banning trawling could be established in the Adriatic Sea as well. Finally, the European Union has legal responsibility for fishery management in European waters. A no-trawl zone could also be implemented based on emergency measures foreseen by the Common Fishery Policy (CFP) [38]. Subsequent to the establishment of a FRA or a fish recovery area under the CFP, additional ecosystems conservation measures could be implemented through the establishment of SPAMI areas, thereby expanding regulation of activities from fishing, as in a FRA, to other marine uses.

(Fig.3. here)

5. Remaining challenges: governance and compliance

Establishing effective MPAs, including LMPAs, requires clear management objectives and the involvement and support of marine users, in particular fishers who generally are the category most directly affected by MPA establishment. The experience with the Pelagos Sanctuary (established in 1999 and entered into force on 2002 as an agreement between Italy, France and Monaco in the northern Tyrrhenian Sea to protect cetaceans, Fig. 1) [20]

1 highlights the importance of setting processes and necessary resources for enforcement of
2 regulations and stakeholder involvement [156]. In fact, since its establishment, Pelagos
3 still lacks a management plan, systematic monitoring or enforcement measures, and there
4 is no evidence that human threats to marine mammals have decreased within the area
5 [157]. Cetaceans living in the sanctuary are toxicologically stressed, and still affected by
6 fishing and potentially harmful military activities [156,158]. The absence of a governance
7 and enforcement body are major reasons for Pelagos' lack of efficacy as a cetacean
8 sanctuary [156].

14 Governance of a transboundary Adriatic LMPA presents unique challenges but also new
15 opportunities. The Adriatic-Ionian Macroregion initiative provides a robust political and
16 economic platform to promote cooperation among Adriatic countries in managing marine
17 uses, and could represent the shared governance body for an Adriatic LMPA. The already
18 existing Adriatic Protected Areas Network (AdriaPAN), a sub-regional network included in
19 the broader MedPAN network, represents an encouraging precedent of the willingness to
20 develop a collaborative strategy among MPAs in the Adriatic region. This operational
21 network of MPAs may serve as a facilitator of the process towards a shared governance
22 body for an offshore Adriatic LMPA.

31 Monitoring and enforcement of regulations within large offshore managed areas require
32 high economic investment [42,44]. New technologies and tools that are currently being
33 developed and tested, such as the use of satellite imagery to counteract illegal fishing
34 [159], will provide new opportunities for real-time, cost-effective surveillance and control of
35 human activities in LMPAs. Involvement and participation of stakeholders such as fishers,
36 tourism operators, and supporters of the LMPA is crucial for enforcement and compliance
37 [160].

50 6. Conclusion

51 The establishment of one or more no-trawl areas in the Adriatic Sea, possibly in the form
52 of a Fisheries Restricted Areas, could provide an unprecedented opportunity to promote
53 the recovery of degraded Mediterranean marine ecosystems and fisheries, and to meet
54 international commitments to expand marine conservation and improve fisheries
55 management. The recognised limitations described for several LMPAs already established

1 around the world could be overcome in the Adriatic basin. The available scientific
2 knowledge identifies the central basin as representative of the main features of the whole
3 Adriatic Sea including both ecological and biological important areas and overexploited
4 bottoms. One of the main obstacles for the establishment of the no-trawl LMPA may derive
5 from the different objectives and priorities of resource use and management of its
6 bordering nations (most importantly Italy and Croatia). However, the critical status of the
7 Adriatic marine resources and ecosystems, and the inefficient results of their current
8 management highlight the urgent need of implementing new conservation actions. The
9 EUSAIR process will provide a robust framework for the development of political,
10 management and governance collaboration needed to establish an effective
11 transboundary LMPA in the Adriatic Sea. One or more Adriatic no-trawl areas could benefit
12 multiple marine users and economic sectors, in addition to fisheries. If successful, it is
13 foreseen that the Adriatic process would provide an important precedent and a model for
14 scaling up protection in other intensely used marine regions worldwide.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Acknowledgments**

29 Azzurra Bastari, Antonio Pusceddu and Carlo Cerrano were supported by a grant from the
30 Polytechnic University of Marche, Italy (the AMER project, Adriatic Marine Ecosystem
31 Recovery). Francesco Ferretti and Fiorenza Micheli acknowledge the support of the
32 Lenfest Oceans Program and Pew Charitable Trust. We thank Roberto Danovaro, Tullio
33 Scovazzi, Domitilla Senni, Giuseppe Notarbartolo di Sciara, and Tundi Agardy for input
34 and advice.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- [1] Report to the United States government. Expansion of the U . S . Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument. The largest Ocean legacy on Earth. E. Sala, L. Morgan, E. Norse, A. Friedlander. May 20, 2014.
- [2] B.C. O’Leary, R.L. Brown, D.E. Johnson, H. von Nordheim, J. Ardron, T. Packeiser, et al. The first network of marine protected areas (MPAs) in the high seas: The process, the challenges and where next. *Mar. Policy*, 36 (2012) 598–605. doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2011.11.003.
- [3] <https://www.thegef.org/gef/ABNJ> (accessed March 1, 2016).
- [4] B.J. Lubchenco, K. Grorud-Colvert. Making waves: The science and politics of ocean protection. *Science* (80-), 350 (2015) 382–3. doi:10.1126/science.aad5443.
- [5] M. Coll, C. Piroddi, C. Albouy, F.B.R. Lasram, W.W.L. Cheung, V. Christensen, et al. The Mediterranean Sea under siege: Spatial overlap between marine biodiversity, cumulative threats and marine reserves. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* 21 (2012) 465–80. doi:10.1111/j.1466-8238.2011.00697.x.
- [6] F. Micheli, N. Levin, S. Giakoumi, S. Katsanevakis, A. Abdulla, M. Coll, et al. Setting Priorities for Regional Conservation Planning in the Mediterranean Sea. *PLoS One*, 8 (2013). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0059038.
- [7] H.K. Lotze, M. Coll, J.A. Dunne. Historical Changes in Marine Resources, Food-web Structure and Ecosystem Functioning in the Adriatic Sea, Mediterranean. *Ecosystems*, 14 (2011) 198–222. doi:10.1007/s10021-010-9404-8.
- [8] M. Coll, C. Piroddi, J. Steenbeek, K. Kaschner, F.B.R. Lasram, J. Aguzzi, et al. The biodiversity of the Mediterranean Sea: Estimates, patterns, and threats. *PLoS One* 5 (2010). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0011842.
- [9] B.J. Cardinale, J.E. Duffy, A. Gonzalez, D.U. Hooper, C. Perrings, P. Venail, et al. Corrigendum: Biodiversity loss and its impact on humanity. *Nature*, 489 (2012), pp.326–326. doi:10.1038/nature11373.
- [10] C. Cerrano, G. Bavestrello. Medium-term effects of die-off of rocky benthos in the Ligurian Sea. What can we learn from gorgonians? *Chem. Ecol.* 24 (2008) 73–82. doi:10.1080/02757540801979648.
- [11] J. Garrabou, R. Coma, N. Bensoussan, M. Bally, P. Chevaldonné, M. Cigliano, et al. Mass mortality in Northwestern Mediterranean rocky benthic communities: effects of the 2003 heat wave. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* 15 (2009) 1090–103. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01823.x.
- [12] 92/43/EEC Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the 586 conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora. N. L 206: 1,50.

- [13] R. Danovaro, J.B. Company, C. Corinaldesi, G. D'Onghia, B. Galil, C. Gambi, et al. Deep-sea biodiversity in the Mediterranean Sea: The known, the unknown, and the unknowable. *PLoS One*, 5 (2010). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0011832.
- [14] S. Giakoumi, M. Sini, V. Gerovasileiou, T. Mazor, J. Beher, H.P. Possingham, et al. Ecoregion-Based Conservation Planning in the Mediterranean: Dealing with Large-Scale Heterogeneity. *PLoS One*, 8 (2013). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0076449.
- [15] C.N. Bianchi, C. Morri. Marine Biodiversity of the Mediterranean Sea: Situation, Problems and Prospects for Future Research. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 40 (2000) 367–76. doi:10.1016/S0025-326X(00)00027-8.
- [16] D. Mouillot, C. Albouy, F. Guilhaumon, F.B.R. Lasram, M. Coll, V. Devictor, et al. Protected and threatened components of fish biodiversity in the Mediterranean Sea. *Curr. Biol.* 21 (2011) 1044–50. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2011.05.005.
- [17] G. Notarbartolo di Sciara, T. Agardy. United Nations Environment Programme Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas “Identification of Potential SPAMIs in Mediterranean Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction”. Contract, 01(2008).
- [18] C. Gabri  , E. Lagabrielle, C. Bissery, E. Crochelet, B. Meola, C. Webster, J. Claudet A. Chassanite, S. Marinesque, P. Robert, M. Goutx, C. Quod. The Status of Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean Sea. *MedPAN & RAC/SPA*. Ed: MedPAN. 2012; 256 pp. <http://www.medpan.org/documents/10180/0/The+Status+of+Marine+Protected+Area+s+in+the+Mediterranean+Sea+2012/069bb5c4-ce3f-4046-82cf-f72dbae29328> (accessed April 14, 2015).
- [19] P.B. Fenberg, J.E. Caselle, J. Claudet, M. Clemence, S.D. Gaines, J.A. Garc  a-Charton J, et al. The science of European marine reserves: Status, efficacy, and future needs. *Mar. Policy*, 36 (2012) 1012–21. doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2012.02.021.
- [20] G. Notarbartolo di Sciara G, T. Agardy, D. Hyrenbach, T. Scovazzi T, P. van Klaveren. The Pelagos Sanctuary for Mediterranean marine mammals. *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.* 18 (2008) 367–91. doi:10.1002/aqc.855.
- [21] M. Coll, A. Santojanni, I. Palomera, E. Arneri. Ecosystem assessment of the North-Central Adriatic Sea: Towards a multivariate reference framework. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 417 (2010) 193–210. doi:10.3354/meps08800.
- [22] A. Barausse, A. Michieli, E. Riginella, L. Palmeri, C. Mazzoldi. Long-term changes in community composition and life-history traits in a highly exploited basin (northern Adriatic Sea): The role of environment and anthropogenic pressures. *J. Fish. Biol.* 79 (2011) 1453–86. doi:10.1111/j.1095-8649.2011.03139.x.
- [23] F. Ferretti, G.C. Osio, C.J. Jenkins, A.A. Rosenberg, H.K. Lotze. Long-term change in a meso-predator community in response to prolonged and heterogeneous human impact. *Sci. Rep.* 3 (2013) 1057. doi:10.1038/srep01057.
- [24] N. Fouzai, M. Coll, I. Palomera, A. Santojanni, E. Arneri, V. Christensen. Fishing management scenarios to rebuild exploited resources and ecosystems of the

Northern-Central Adriatic (Mediterranean Sea). J. Mar. Syst. 102-104 (2012) 39–51. doi:10.1016/j.jmarsys.2012.05.003.

- [25] B. Worm, E.B. Barbier, N. Beaumont, J.E. Duffy, C. Folke, B.S. Halpern, et al. Impacts of biodiversity loss on ocean ecosystem services. Science, 314 (2006) 787–90. doi:10.1126/science.1132294.
- [26] S. Jukic-Peladic, N. Vrgoc, S. Krstulovic-Sifner, C. Piccinetti, G. Piccinetti-Manfrin, G. Marano, et al. Long-term changes in demersal resources of the Adriatic Sea: Comparison between trawl surveys carried out in 1948 and 1998. Fish. Res. 53 (2001) 95–104. doi:10.1016/S0165-7836(00)00232-0.
- [27] T. Fortibuoni, S. Libralato, S. Raicevich, O. Giovanardi, C. Solidoro. Coding early naturalists' accounts into long-term fish community changes in the Adriatic Sea (1800-2000). PLoS One, 5 (2010) 1–8. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0015502.
- [28] M. Romanelli, C.A. Cordisco, O. Giovanardi. The long-term decline of the *Chamelea gallina* L. (Bivalvia: Veneridae) clam fishery in the Adriatic Sea: is a synthesis possible? Act. Adriat., 50 (2009) 171–204.
- [29] N. Jones. Marine protection goes large. Nature, (2011). doi:10.1038/news.2011.292.
- [30] J. Claudet, C.W. Osenberg, L. Benedetti-Cecchi, P. Domenici, J.A. García-Charton, A. Pérez-Ruzafa, et al. Marine reserves: size and age do matter. Ecol. Lett. 11 (2008) 481–9. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01166.x.
- [31] C. Pala. Giant Marine Reserves Pose Vast Challenges. Science, 339 (2013) 640–641.
- [32] S. Murawski, R. Brown, H. Lai, P.J. Rago, L. Hendrickson. Large-scale closed area as a fishery tool in temperate marine systems: the Georges Bank experience. Bull. Mar. Sci. 66 (2000) 775–98.
- [33] G.J. Edgar, R.D. Stuart-Smith, T.J. Willis, S. Kininmonth, S.C. Baker, S. Banks, et al. Global conservation outcomes depend on marine protected areas with five key features. Nature, 506 (2014) 216–20. doi:10.1038/nature13022.
- [34] E. Sala, C. Costello, D. Dougherty, G. Heal, K. Kelleher, J.H. Murray, et al. A General Business Model for Marine Reserves. PLoS One, 8 (2013) 1–9. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0058799.
- [35] A. Batel, J. Basta, P. Mackelworth. Valuing visitor willingness to pay for marine conservation – The case of the proposed Cres-Lošinj Marine Protected Area, Croatia. Ocean Coast. Manage. 95 (2014) 72–80. doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2014.03.025
- [36] A. McCrea-Strub, D. Zeller, U. Rashid Sumaila, J. Nelson, A. Balmford, D. Pauly. Understanding the cost of establishing marine protected areas. Mar. Policy, 35 (2011) 1–9. doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2010.07.001.

- [37] A. Balmford, A. Bruner, P. Cooper, R. Costanza, S. Farber, R.E. Green, et al. Economic reasons for conserving wild nature. *Science*, 297 (2002) 950–3. doi:10.1126/science.1073947.
- [38] E.M. de Santo. Missing marine protected area (MPA) targets: How the push for quantity over quality undermines sustainability and social justice. *J. Environ. Manage.* 124 (2013) 137–46. doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2013.01.033.
- [39] T.A. Wilhelm, C.R.C. Sheppard, A.L.S. Sheppard, C.F. Gaymer, J. Parks, D. Wagner, et al. Large marine protected areas - advantages and challenges of going big. *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.* 24 (2014) 24–30. doi:10.1002/aqc.2499.
- [40] H.E. Fox, C.S. Soltanoff, M.B. Mascia, K.M. Haisfield, A.V. Lombana, C.R. Pyke, et al. Explaining global patterns and trends in marine protected area (MPA) development. *Mar. Policy*, 36 (2012) 1131–8. doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2012.02.007.
- [41] S. Kark, A. Tulloch, A. Gordon, T. Mazor, N. Bunnefeld, N. Levin. Cross-boundary collaboration: key to the conservation puzzle. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* 12 (2015) 12–24. doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2014.08.005.
- [42] C. Toropova, I. Meliane, D. Laffoley, E. Matthews, M. Spalding. (Eds). *Global ocean protection : present status and future possibilities*. 2010. Brest France: Agence des aires marines protégées, Gland, Switzerland, Washington, DC and New York, USA: IUCN WCPA, Cambridge, UK: UNEP-WCMC, Arlington, USA: TNC, Tokyo, Japan: UNU, New York, USA: WCS. 96 pp.
- [43] D. Cressey. Uncertain sanctuary. *Nature*, 480(7376) (2011) 166-167. n.d. http://plavisvijet.hr/media/files/getting_the_ballance_MPAs_Nature_166-167.pdf (accessed April 9, 2015).
- [44] P. Leenhardt, B. Cazalet, B. Salvat, J. Claudet, F. Feral. The rise of large-scale marine protected areas: Conservation or geopolitics? *Ocean. Coast. Manag.* 85 (2013) 112–8. doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2013.08.013.
- [45] P. Mackelworth. Peace parks and transboundary initiatives: implications for marine conservation and spatial planning. *Conserv. Lett.* 5 (2012) 90–8. doi:10.1111/j.1755-263X.2012.00223.x.
- [46] D.M. Kaplan, P. Bach, S. Bonhommeau, E. Chassot, P. Chavance, L. Dagorn, et al. The true challenge of giant marine reserves. *Science*, 340 (2013) 810–1. doi:10.1126/science.340.6134.810-b.
- [47] R. Hilborn. Environmental cost of conservation victories. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U S A*, 110 (2013) 9187. doi:10.1073/pnas.1308962110.
- [48] R. Devillers, R.L. Pressey, A. Grech, J.N. Kittinger, G.J. Edgar, T. Ward, et al. Reinventing residual reserves in the sea: Are we favouring ease of establishment over need for protection? *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.* 2014. doi:10.1002/aqc.2445.

- [49] R.L. Singleton, C.M. Roberts. The contribution of very large marine protected areas to marine conservation: Giant leaps or smoke and mirrors? *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 87 (2014) 7–10. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.07.067.
- [50] P. Guidetti, M. Lorenti, M.C. Buia, L. Mazzella. Temporal dynamics and biomass partitioning in three Adriatic seagrass species: *Posidonia oceanica*, *Cymodocea nodosa*, *Zostera marina*. *Mar. Ecol.* 23 (2002) 51–67. doi:10.1046/j.1439-0485.2002.02722.x.
- [51] S. Casellato, A. Stefanon. Coralligenous habitat in the northern Adriatic Sea: An overview. *Mar. Ecol.* 29 (2008) 321–41. doi:10.1111/j.1439-0485.2008.00236.x.
- [52] R. Sanfilippo, A. Vertino, A. Rosso, L. Beuck, A. Freiwald, M. Taviani. *Serpula* aggregates and their role in deep-sea coral communities in the southern Adriatic Sea. *Facies*, 59 (2013) 663–77. doi:10.1007/s10347-012-0356-7.
- [53] UNEP/MAP-RAC/SPA. 2015. Adriatic Sea: Description of the ecology and identification of the areas that may deserve to be protected. By C. Cerrano. Ed. RAC/SPA, Tunis. 2015; 92 pp.
- [54] E.B. Morello, C. Frogia, R.J.A. Atkinson, P.G. Moore. Hydraulic dredge discards of the clam (*Chamelea gallina*) fishery in the western Adriatic Sea, Italy. *Fish. Res.* 76 (2005) 430–44. doi:10.1016/j.fishres.2005.07.002.
- [55] T. Russo, J. Pulcinella, A. Parisi, M. Martinelli, A. Belardinelli, A. Santojanni, et al. Modelling the strategy of mid-water trawlers targeting small pelagic fish in the Adriatic Sea and its drivers. *Ecol. Modell.* 300 (2015) 102–13. doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2014.12.001.
- [56] C. Mazzoldi, A. Sambo, E. Riginella. The Clodia database: a long time series of fishery data from the Adriatic Sea. *Scientific data*, 1 (2014).
- [57] IREPA Onlus Osservatorio economico sulle strutture produttive della pesca marittima in Italia 2011 Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 2012; pp. 252. [http://www.irepa.org/attachments/article/320/Osservatorio Nazionale 2011.pdf](http://www.irepa.org/attachments/article/320/Osservatorio_Nazionale_2011.pdf) (accessed March 24, 2015).
- [58] FAO Fisheries & Aquaculture - Fishery and Aquaculture Country Profiles - The Republic of Italy n.d. <http://www.fao.org/fishery/facp/ITA/en#CountrySector-ProductionSector> (accessed October 6, 2015).
- [59] F. Micheli, B.S. Halpern, S. Walbridge, S. Ciriaco, F. Ferretti, S. Fraschetti, et al. Cumulative human impacts on Mediterranean and Black Sea marine ecosystems: Assessing current pressures and opportunities. *PLoS One*, 8 (2013). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0079889.
- [60] M. Coll, A. Santojanni, I. Palomera, E. Arneri. Food-web changes in the Adriatic Sea over the last three decades. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 381 (2009) 17–37. doi:10.3354/meps07944.

- [61] A. Conversi, S. Fonda Umani, T. Peluso, J.C. Molinero, A. Santojanni, M. Edwards. The Mediterranean Sea Regime Shift at the End of the 1980s, and Intriguing Parallelisms with Other European Basins. *PLoS One*, 5 (2010) e10633. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0010633.
- [62] R. Danovaro, S. Fonda Umani, A. Pusceddu. Climate change and the potential spreading of marine mucilage and microbial pathogens in the Mediterranean Sea. *PLoS One*, 4 (2009) e7006. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0007006.
- [63] A. Pusceddu, S. Bianchelli, J. Martín, P. Puig, A. Palanques, P. Masqué, et al. Chronic and intensive bottom trawling impairs deep-sea biodiversity and ecosystem functioning. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U S A*, 111 (2014) 8861–6. doi:10.1073/pnas.1405454111.
- [64] D. Degobbis, M. Gilmartin, N. Revelante. An annotated nitrogen budget calculation for the northern Adriatic Sea. *Mar. Chem.* 20 (1986) 159–77. doi:10.1016/0304-4203(86)90037-X.
- [65] D. Degobbis, R. Precali, I. Ivancic, N. Smodlaka, D. Fuks, S. Kveder. Long-term changes in the northern Adriatic ecosystem related to anthropogenic eutrophication. *Int J Environ Pollut* (2000).
- [66] M. Stachowitsch. Anoxia in the Northern Adriatic Sea: rapid death, slow recovery. *Geol Soc London, Spec. Publ.* 58 (1991) 119–29. doi:10.1144/GSL.SP.1991.058.01.09.
- [67] European Commission. “The potential of Maritime Spatial Planning in the Mediterranean Sea ” Case study report : The Adriatic Sea 2011;32 pp.
- [68] G. Ferraro, A. Bernardini, M. David, S. Meyer-Roux, O. Muellenhoff, M. Perkovic, et al. Towards an operational use of space imagery for oil pollution monitoring in the Mediterranean basin: a demonstration in the Adriatic Sea. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 54 (2007) 403–22. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2006.11.022.
- [69] E. Twrdy, M. Batista. Competition between container ports in the northern Adriatic. *Int. J. Traf. Transp. Eng.* 4(4) (2014) 363 - 371. [http://www.ijtte.com/uploads/2014-12-19/935be804-40bb-9f85IJTTE_Vol 4\(4\)_1.pdf](http://www.ijtte.com/uploads/2014-12-19/935be804-40bb-9f85IJTTE_Vol 4(4)_1.pdf) (accessed February 8, 2016).
- [70] Rectors & Deans & Business Directors on Transport & Logistics Joint EU Opportunities. North Adriatic Ports : A Gateway to Central Europe . 2015. Bozicnik S. University of Maribor, Slovenia, Portoroz, 26th January 2015.
- [71] H. Carić, P. Mackelworth. Cruise tourism environmental impacts – The perspective from the Adriatic Sea. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* 102 (2014) 350–63. doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2014.09.008.
- [72] M. Randone. 2016. MedTrends Project: Blue Growth Trends in the Adriatic Sea - the challenge of environmental protection. WWF Mediterranean. http://www.medtrends.org/reports/MedTrends_AD-Report.pdf (accessed February 9, 2016).

- [73] C. Lejeusne, P. Chevaldonné, C. Pergent-Martini, C.F. Boudouresque, T. Pérez. Climate change effects on a miniature ocean: the highly diverse, highly impacted Mediterranean Sea. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 25 (2010) 250–60. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2009.10.009.
- [74] A. Zenetos, S. Gofas, M. Verlaque, M.E. Inar, J.E. Garci, C.N. Bianchi, et al. Alien species in the Mediterranean Sea by 2010. A contribution to the application of European Union's Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD). Part I . Spatial distribution (2011)509–14.
- [75] A. Occhipinti-Ambrogi, A. Marchini, G. Cantone, A. Castelli, C. Chimenz, M. Cormaci et al. Alien species along the Italian coasts: An overview. *Biol. Invasions*, 13 (2010) 215–37. doi:10.1007/s10530-010-9803-y.
- [76] M. Pecarevic, J. Mikus, A. Bratos Cetinic, J. Dulcic, M. Calic. Introduced marine species in Croatian waters (Eastern Adriatic Sea). *Mediterr. Mar. Sci.* 14 (2013) 224–37. doi:10.12681/mms.383.
- [77] L. Piazzzi, D. Balata. Invasion of alien macroalgae in different Mediterranean habitats. *Biol. Invasions* 11 (2008) 193–204. doi:10.1007/s10530-008-9224-3.
- [78] M. Demestre, S. de Juan, P. Sartor, A. Ligas. Seasonal closures as a measure of trawling effort control in two Mediterranean trawling grounds: Effects on epibenthic communities. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 56 (2008) 1765–73. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2008.06.004.
- [79] UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA. 2014. Status and Conservation of Fisheries in the Adriatic Sea. By H. Farrugio, A. Soldo. Draft internal report for the purposes of the Mediterranean Regional Workshop to Facilitate the Description of Ecologically or Biologically Sign n.d. <https://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/mar/ebsaws-2014-03/other/ebsaws-2014-03-submission-rac-spa-sr-02-en.pdf> (accessed October 8, 2015).
- [80] MEDACD, Mediterranean Advisory Council. 1st WG, 17 FG on G, Croatia. Informative document on the state of small pelagic fisheries in GSA 17;1–33.
- [81] Ssgesst ICM. ICES WGNEPS REPORT 2014 Second Interim Report of the Working Group on Nephrops Surveys (WGNEPS) 2014;4–6.
- [82] S. de Juan, J. Lleonart. A conceptual framework for the protection of vulnerable habitats impacted by fishing activities in the Mediterranean high seas. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* 53 (2010) 717–23. doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2010.10.005.
- [83] E. Arneri, B. Morales-Nin. Aspects of the early life history of European hake from the central Adriatic. *J. Fish. Biol.* 56 (2000) 1368–80. doi:10.1111/j.1095-8649.2000.tb02149.x.
- [84] E.B. Morello, B. Antolini, M.E. Gramitto, R.J.A. Atkinson, C. Frogli. The fishery for *Nephrops norvegicus* (Linnaeus, 1758) in the central Adriatic Sea (Italy): Preliminary observations comparing bottom trawl and baited creels. *Fish. Res.* 95 (2009) 325–31. doi:10.1016/j.fishres.2008.10.002.

- [85] F. Colloca, G. Garofalo, I. Bitetto, M.T. Facchini, F. Grati, A. Martiradonna, et al. The seascape of demersal fish nursery areas in the north Mediterranean Sea, a first step towards the implementation of spatial planning for trawl fisheries. PLoS One, 10 (2015) e0119590. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0119590.
- [86] M. Martinelli, E.B. Morello, I. Isajlovic, A. Belardinelli, A. Lucchetti, A. Santojanni, et al. Towed underwater television towards the quantification of Norway lobster, squat lobsters and sea pens in the Adriatic Sea. Acta Adriat. 54(1) (2013) 3-12.
- [87] AdriaMed. 2011. Report of the Twelfth Meeting of the AdriaMed Coordination Committee. FAO-MiPAAF Scientific Cooperation to Support Responsible Fisheries in the Adriatic Sea. GCP/RER/010/ITA/TD28. AdriaMed Technical Documents, 28: 30 pp. n.d. <http://www.faoadriamed.org/pdf/publications/web-td-28.pdf> (accessed June 26, 2015).
- [88] Decreto 3 luglio 2015. Ministero delle politiche agricole alimentari e forestali. Arresto temporaneo obbligatorio delle unita' autorizzate all'esercizio della pesca con il sistema a strascico - Annualita' 2015. (15A05454) (GU Serie Generale n.162 del 15-7-2015).
- [89] P.K. Dayton, S.F. Thrush, M.T. Agardy, R.J. Hofman. Environmental effects of marine fishing. Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst. 5 (1995) 205–32. doi:10.1002/aqc.3270050305.
- [90] G.I. Lambert, S. Jennings, M.J. Kaiser, T.W. Davies, J.G. Hiddink. Quantifying recovery rates and resilience of seabed habitats impacted by bottom fishing. J. Appl. Ecol. (2014) 1326–36. doi:10.1111/1365-2664.12277.
- [91] M.R. Clark, F. Althaus, T.A. Schlacher, A. Williams, D.A. Bowden, A.A. Rowden. The impacts of deep-sea fisheries on benthic communities: a review. ICES J. Mar. Sci. (2015). doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsv123..
- [92] R. Lewison, L. Crowder, A. Read, S. Freeman. Understanding impacts of fisheries bycatch on marine megafauna. Trends. Ecol. Evol. 19 (2004) 598–604. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2004.09.004.
- [93] L. Alessandro, S. Antonello. An overview of loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*) bycatch and technical mitigation measures in the Mediterranean Sea. Rev. Fish. Biol. Fish. 20 (2009) 141–61. doi:10.1007/s11160-009-9126-1.
- [94] P. Casale. Sea turtle by-catch in the Mediterranean. Fish. Fish. 12 (2011) 299–316. doi:10.1111/j.1467-2979.2010.00394.x.
- [95] P. Casale, L. Laurent, G. de Metrio. Incidental capture of marine turtles by the Italian trawl fishery in the north Adriatic Sea. Biol. Conserv. 119 (2004) 287–95. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2003.11.013.
- [96] C. Pipitone, F. Badalamenti, G. D'Anna, B. Patti B. Fish biomass increase after a four-year trawl ban in the Gulf of Castellammare (NW Sicily, Mediterranean Sea). Fish. Res. 48 (2000) 23–30. doi:10.1016/S0165-7836(00)00114-4.

- [97] S. de Juan, M. Demestre, P. Sanchez. Exploring the degree of trawling disturbance by the analysis of benthic communities ranging from a heavily exploited fishing ground to an undisturbed area in the NW Mediterranean. *Sci. Mar.* 75 (2011) 507–16. doi:10.3989/scimar.2011.75n3507.
- [98] M.A. Hixon, B.N. Tissot. Comparison of trawled vs untrawled mud seafloor assemblages of fishes and macroinvertebrates at Coquille Bank, Oregon. *J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol.* 344 (2007) 23–34. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2006.12.026.
- [99] A. Cogswell, E. Kenchington, C. Lirette, F.J. Murillo, G. Campanis, N. Campbell, et al. Layers Utilized by an ArcGIS Model to Approximate Commercial Coral and Sponge By-catch in the NAFO Regulatory Area 2011.
- [100] C. Cerrano, S. Bianchelli, C.G. Di Camillo, F. Torsani, A. Pusceddu. Do colonies of *Lytocarpia myriophyllum*, L. 1758 (Cnidaria, Hydrozoa) affect the biochemical composition and the meiofaunal diversity of surrounding sediments? *Chem. Ecol.* 31 (2015) 1–21. doi:10.1080/02757540.2014.966699.
- [101] J. Collie, G. Escanero, P. Valentine. Effects of bottom fishing on the benthic megafauna of Georges Bank. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 155 (1997) 159–72.
- [102] M.J. Fogarty, S.A. Murawski. Large-scale disturbance and the structure of marine systems: fishery impacts on georges bank. *Ecol. Appl.* 8 (1998) S6–22. doi:10.1890/1051-0761(1998)8[S6:LDATSO]2.0.CO;2.
- [103] S. Murawski, S. Wigley, M. Fogarty, P. Rago, D. Mountain. Effort distribution and catch patterns adjacent to temperate MPAs. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* 62 (2005) 1150–67. doi:10.1016/j.icesjms.2005.04.005.
- [104] C. Bordehore, A. Ramos-Esplá, R. Riosmena-Rodríguez. Comparative study of two maerl beds with different otter trawling history, southeast Iberian Peninsula. *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.* 13 (2003) 43–54. doi:10.1002/aqc.567.
- [105] V.M. Giacalone, G. D’Anna, F. Badalamenti, C. Pipitone. Weight-length relationships and condition factor trends for thirty-eight fish species in trawled and untrawled areas off the coast of northern Sicily (central Mediterranean Sea). *J. Appl. Ichthyol.* 26 (2010) 954–7. doi:10.1111/j.1439-0426.2010.01491.x.
- [106] F.R. Gell, C.M. Roberts. Benefits beyond boundaries: The fishery effects of marine reserves. *Trends. Ecol. Evol.* 18 (2003) 448–55. doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(03)00189-7.
- [107] D. Whitmarsh, C. Pipitone, F. Badalamenti, G. D’Anna. The economic sustainability of artisanal fisheries: the case of the trawl ban in the Gulf of Castellammare, NW Sicily. *Mar. Policy*, 27 (2003) 489–97. doi:10.1016/S0308-597X(03)00062-9.
- [108] A. Barausse, V. Correale, A. Curkovic, L. Finotto, E. Riginella, E. Visentin, et al. The role of fisheries and the environment in driving the decline of elasmobranchs in the northern Adriatic Sea. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* 71 (2014) 1593–603. doi:10.1093/icesjms/fst222.

- [109] D. Whitmarsh, C. James, H. Pickering, C. Pipitone, F. Badalamenti, G. D'Anna. Perspectives Economic Effects of Fisheries Exclusion Zones: A Sicilian Case Study. *Mar. Resour. Econ.* 17 (2002) 239–50.
- [110] C. Bailey. Lessons from Indonesia's 1980 trawler ban. *Mar. Policy*, 21(3) (1997) 225-235.
- [111] J.K. Reed, A.N. Shepard, C.C. Koenig, K.M. Scanlon, R.G. Gilmore Jr. Mapping, habitat characterization, and fish surveys of the deep-water *Oculina* coral reef Marine Protected Area: a review of historical and current research. In *Cold-water Corals and Ecosystems*. Ed. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. 2005;pp. 443-465.
- [112] B.D. Beukers-Stewart, B.J. Vause, M.W. Mosley, H.L. Rossetti, A.R. Brand. Benefits of closed area protection for a population of scallops. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 298(15) (2005) 189-204.
- [113] L.J. McCook, T. Ayling, M. Cappo, J.H. Choat, R.D. Evans, D.M. de Freitas, et al. Adaptive management of the Great Barrier Reef: a globally significant demonstration of the benefits of networks of marine reserves. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U S A*, 107 (2010) 18278–85. doi:10.1073/pnas.0909335107.
- [114] D.T. Welsh. It's a dirty job but someone has to do it: The role of marine benthic macrofauna in organic matter turnover and nutrient recycling to the water column. *Chem. Ecol.* 19 (2003) 321–42. doi:10.1080/0275754031000155474.
- [115] J.B. Jackson. What was natural in the coastal oceans? *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U S A*, 98 (2001) 5411–8. doi:10.1073/pnas.091092898.
- [116] A.M. Lohrer, S.F. Thrush, M.M. Gibbs. Bioturbators enhance ecosystem function through complex biogeochemical interactions. *Nature*, 431 (2004) 1092–5. doi:10.1038/nature03042.
- [117] D.R. Sandwell, C.A. Pilditch, A.M. Lohrer. Density dependent effects of an infaunal suspension-feeding bivalve (*Austrovenus stutchburyi*) on sandflat nutrient fluxes and microphytobenthic productivity. *J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol.* 373 (2009) 16–25. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2009.02.015.
- [118] M. Baeta, M. Ramón, E. Galimany. Decline of a *Callista chione* (Bivalvia: Veneridae) bed in the Maresme coast (northwestern Mediterranean Sea). *Ocean Coast. Manag.* 93 (2014) 15–25. doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2014.03.001.
- [119] R.C. Aller, J.Y. Aller. The effect of biogenic irrigation intensity and solute exchange on diagenetic reaction rates in marine sediments. *J. Mar. Res.* 56 (1998) 905–36. doi:10.1357/002224098321667413.
- [120] C. Officer, T. Smayda, R. Mann. Benthic Filter Feeding: A Natural Eutrophication Control. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 9 (1982) 203–10. doi:10.3354/meps009203.
- [121] A. Norkko, J.E. Hewitt, S.F. Thrush, G.A. Funnell. Conditional outcomes of facilitation by a habitat-modifying subtidal bivalve. *Ecology*, 87 (2006) 226–34. doi:10.1890/05-0176.

- [122] R.E. Newell. Ecological changes in Chesapeake Bay: Are they the result of overharvesting the American oyster, *Crassostrea virginica*. Underst. Estuary Adv. Chesap. Bay Res. 129 (1988) 536–46.
- [123] M.W. Beck, R.D. Brumbaugh, L. Airoidi, A. Carranza, L.D. Coen, C. Crawford, et al. Oyster Reefs at Risk and Recommendations for Conservation, Restoration, and Management. Bioscience, 61 (2011) 107–16. doi:10.1525/bio.2011.61.2.5.
- [124] F. Pranovi, S. Raicevich, G. Franceschini, M.G. Farrace, O. Giovanardi. Rapido trawling in the northern Adriatic Sea: effects on benthic communities in an experimental area. Ices J. Mar. Sci. 57 (2000) 517–24. doi:10.1006/jmsc.2000.0708.
- [125] F. Boero. The future of the Mediterranean Sea Ecosystem: towards a different tomorrow. Rend. Lincei, 26 (2014) 3–12. doi:10.1007/s12210-014-0340-y.
- [126] T. Bay, G. Bay, S. Bay, K. Bay, D. Bay, L. Worth L. Supplementary Table S1 Oyster Reefs at Risk Beck et al . Oysters Reefs at Risk S1 Beck et al . Oysters Reefs at Risk S2 n.d.:90–9.
- [127] J.B.C. Jackson. Colloquium paper: ecological extinction and evolution in the brave new ocean. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U S A, 105 (2008), Suppl :11458–65. doi:10.1073/pnas.0802812105.
- [128] H.K. Lotze. Depletion, Degradation, and Recovery Potential of Estuaries and Coastal Seas. Science (80-), 312 (2006) 1806–9. doi:10.1126/science.1128035.
- [129] V. Moschino, M.G. Marin. Seasonal changes in physiological responses and evaluation of “well-being” in the Venus clam *Chamelea gallina* from the Northern Adriatic Sea. Comp. Biochem. Physiol. - A Mol. Integr. Physiol. 145 (2006) 433–40. doi:10.1016/j.cbpa.2006.07.021.
- [130] J. Haure, C. Penisson, S. Bougrier, J.P. Baud. Influence of temperature on clearance and oxygen consumption rates of the flat oyster *Ostrea edulis*: Determination of allometric coefficients. Aquaculture, 169 (1998) 211–24. doi:10.1016/S0044-8486(98)00383-4.
- [131] J.J. Bell. The functional roles of marine sponges. Estuar. Coast. Shelf. Sci., 79 (2008) 341–53. doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2008.05.002.
- [132] H. Kollmann, M. Stachowitsch. Long-Term Changes in the Benthos of the Northern Adriatic Sea: A Phototransect Approach. Mar. Ecol. 22 (2001) 135–54. doi:10.1046/j.1439-0485.2001.01761.x.
- [133] F. Micheli, B.S. Halpern. Low functional redundancy in coastal marine assemblages. Ecol. Lett. 8 (2005) 391–400. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00731.x.
- [134] B.S. Halpern, S. Walbridge, K.A. Selkoe, C.V. Kappel, F. Micheli, C. D’Agrosa, et al. A global map of human impact on marine ecosystems. Science, 319 (2008) 948–52. doi:10.1126/science.1149345.

- [135] F. Micheli, A. Saenz-Arroyo, A. Greenley, L. Vazquez, J.A. Espinoza Montes, M. Rossetto, et al. Evidence that marine reserves enhance resilience to climatic impacts. *PLoS One*, 7 (2012) e40832. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0040832.
- [136] http://ec.europa.eu/maritimeaffairs/documentation/publications/documents/poster-blue-growth-2014_en.pdf (accessed June 25, 2015).
- [137] B. Sekulić, D. Fuks. Sanitarna kvaliteta Jadranskog mora na hrvatskom priobalnom i otočnom području. *Hrvat .Geogr. Glas.* 61 (1999) 12–3.
- [138] A.M. Cisneros-Montemayor, U.R. Sumaila. A global estimate of benefits from ecosystem-based marine recreation: potential impacts and implications for management. *J. Bioeconomics*, 12 (2010) 245–68. doi:10.1007/s10818-010-9092-7.
- [139] A.J. Gallagher, N. Hammerschlag. Global shark currency: the distribution, frequency, and economic value of shark ecotourism. *Curr. Issues. Tour.* 14 (2011) 797–812. doi:10.1080/13683500.2011.585227.
- [140] A.M. Cisneros-Montemayor, M. Barnes-Mauthe, D. Al-Abdulrazzak, E. Navarro-Holm, U.R. Sumaila. Global economic value of shark ecotourism: implications for conservation. *Oryx*. 47 (2013) 381–8. doi:10.1017/S0030605312001718.
- [141] A.M. Cisneros-Montemayor, U.R. Sumaila, K. Kaschner, D. Pauly. The global potential for whale watching. *Mar. Policy*, 34 (2010) 1273–8. doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2010.05.005.
- [142] S. Katsanevakis, N. Levin, M. Coll, S. Giakoumi, D. Shkedi, P. Mackelworth, et al. Marine conservation challenges in an era of economic crisis and geopolitical instability: The case of the Mediterranean Sea. *Mar. Policy*, 51 (2015) 31–9. doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2014.07.013.
- [143] P. Mackelworth, D. Holcer, J. Jovanović, C. Fortuna. Marine conservation and accession: The future for the Croatian Adriatic. *Environ. Manage.* 47 (2011) 644–55. doi:10.1007/s00267-010-9460-z.
- [144] The UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, the European Union and the Rule of Law: What is going on in the Adriatic Sea? n.d. <http://www.fni.no/doc&pdf/FNI-R1208.pdf> (accessed June 25, 2015).
- [145] NETCET - Network for the Conservation of Cetaceans and Sea Turtles in the Adriatic. <http://www.netcet.eu/> (accessed April 21, 2015).
- [146] Devotes Project — Development of innovative tools for understanding marine biodiversity and assessing good environmental status n.d. <http://www.devotes-project.eu/> (accessed April 21, 2015)..
- [147] <http://www.coconet-fp7.eu/> (accessed April 21, 2015).
- [148] <http://adriplan.eu/> (accessed April 21, 2015).

- [149] <http://www.perseus-net.eu/site/content.php?locale=1&sel=419&artid=364> (accessed April 21, 2015).
- [150] UNEP/CBD/EBSA/WS/2014/3/4. Report of the Mediterranean Regional Workshop to Facilitate the Description of Ecologically or Biologically Significant Marine Areas. By D. Cebrian. Ed. RAC/SPA, Tunis, 2015; 218 pp.
- [151] M.R. Clark, A.A. Rowden, T.A. Schlacher, J. Guinotte, P.K. Dunstan, A. Williams, et al. Identifying Ecologically or Biologically Significant Areas (EBSA): A systematic method and its application to seamounts in the South Pacific Ocean. *Ocean. Coast. Manag.* 91 (2014) 65–79.
- [152] M.E. Portman, G. Notarbartolo di Sciara, T. Agardy, S. Katsanevakis, H.P. Possingham, G. di Carlo. He who hesitates is lost: Why conservation in the Mediterranean Sea is necessary and possible now. *Mar. Policy*, 42 (2013) 270–9. doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2013.03.004.
- [153] Ecologically or Biologically Significant Marine Areas (EBSAs) n.d. <https://www.cbd.int/ebsa/ebsas> (accessed October 6, 2015).
- [154] L. Angeletti, M. Taviani, S. Canese, F. Foglini, F. Mastrototaro, A. Argnani, et al. New deep-water cnidarian sites in the southern Adriatic Sea. *Mediterr. Mar. Sci.* 15 (2014) 263–73. doi:10.12681/mms.558.
- [155] Mediterranean Sensitive Habitats. Ed. by M. Giannoulaki, A. Belluscio, F. Colloca, S. Frascchetti, M. Scardi, C. Smith, P. Panayotidis, V. Valavanis, M.T. Spedicato. DG MARE Specific Contract SI2.600741, Final Report, 2013;557 pp.
- [156] G. Notarbartolo di Sciara. The Pelagos Sanctuary for the conservation of Mediterranean marine mammals: an iconic High Seas MPA in dire straits. 2nd Int Conf. Prog. Mar. Conserv. Eur. (2009) 1–3.
- [157] S. Panigada, G. Lauriano, L. Burt, N. Pierantonio, G. Donovan. Monitoring winter and summer abundance of cetaceans in the Pelagos Sanctuary (Northwestern Mediterranean sea) through aerial surveys. *PLoS One*, 6 (2011). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0022878.
- [158] M.C. Fossi, C. Panti, L. Marsili, S. Maltese, G. Spinsanti, S. Casini, et al. The Pelagos Sanctuary for Mediterranean marine mammals: Marine Protected Area (MPA) or marine polluted area? The case study of the striped dolphin (*Stenella coeruleoalba*). *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 70 (2013) 64–72. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.02.013.
- [159] Project Eyes on the Seas n.d. <http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/multimedia/video/2015/project-eyes-on-the-seas> (accessed June 25, 2015).
- [160] F. Micheli, F. Niccolini. Achieving success under pressure in the conservation of intensely used coastal areas. *Ecology and Society*, 18.4 (2013) 19. <http://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/handle/10535/9231> (accessed November 17, 2015).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure captions


Fig.1. Existing MPAs and LMPAs. Top: the world LMPAs (black polygons) generated by UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP WCMC) using data from the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA). Bottom: Mediterranean MPAs (black polygons), including Pelagos, in the northern Tyrrhenian Sea.

Fig.2. Current protection of the marine environment in the Adriatic Sea (February 2016). The picture shows the current distribution of Adriatic MPAs (black stars), of the temporal closure areas (grey polygons) and the temporary no-trawl areas of Jabuka-Pomo Pit (the big black polygon). The dashed lines show the territorial sea boundaries of Italy and Croatia and the limit of the continental shelf.

Fig.3. Adriatic Sea EBSAs. The delimited polygons show the proposed EBSAs of the Adriatic Sea (as reported by <https://www.cbd.int/ebsa/>).

Figure

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Figure

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Table 1. Benefits and limitations of large and very large MPAs (LMPAs and VLMPAs).

Benefits
<p>LMPAs may comprise the entire home range of threatened species or overexploited commercial stocks, thereby effectively protecting or recovering these populations [29,30]</p> <p>By protecting larger portions of the ocean than MPAs, LMPAs ensure connectivity through the dispersal of larvae and early life stages of marine species [31]</p> <p>LMPAs are effective in protection of migratory species, in addition to sedentary organisms [31–33]</p> <p>LMPAs have potential economic benefits including enhancement of local fisheries [34], increased sustainable tourism [34,35], and maintenance of ecosystem services [25,34]; LMPAs are expected to provide these benefits and are less expensive per unit area than smaller MPAs [36,37]</p> <p>LMPAs constitute a mechanism for preventing future overexploitation and degradation of currently remote and near-pristine ecosystems (e.g., Global Ocean Legacy, http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/projects/global-ocean-legacy)</p> <p>LMPAs allow for expansion of globally protected areas, thereby achieving the conservation targets of international agreements (e.g., CBD) [38–40]</p> <p>Transboundary LMPAs provide opportunities for international cooperation among States [2,38,41]</p>
Limitations and uncertainties
<p>It is difficult to ensure adequate surveillance and enforcement, and therefore effective protection of LMPAs [31]. New control technologies are needed before LMPAs can become an effective conservation and management tool [41–43].</p> <p>Reaching agreements between multiple states adds a further layer of complexity in the establishment of LMPAs, if they are transboundary,[45]</p> <p>Empirical evidence that LMPAs effectively protect exploited populations within their boundaries is still limited [46,47].</p> <p>Creation of LMPAs redirects fishing effort in other areas that are perhaps less effectively managed than where closure is planned [47]</p> <p>Because of the large extent of protection, larvae and early life stages will benefit only the area under protection without any benefit for adjacent areas because larval and juvenile export across the MPA boundary is limited [46]</p> <p>LMPAs are typically established in remote areas and may take resources and political support away from areas where protection is most urgently needed (e.g., densely populated coastal areas) and may provide economic benefits [48,49]</p> <p>LMPAs can be established only in remote and unpopulated areas where marine ecosystems are in the least need of protection [44]</p>

Table 2. Pillars and topics of the European Strategy for the Adriatic Ionian Macroregion (EUSAIR) initiative (<http://www.adriatic-ionian.eu/about/pillars>)

	TOPICS
PILLAR 1: BLUE GROWTH	1) Promote research and development of blue technologies 2) Promote sustainable seafood production and consumption (fishery and aquaculture) 3) Improve maritime and marine governance and services
PILLAR 2: CONNECTING THE REGION	1) Strengthen maritime safety and security (maritime transport) 2) Intermodal connections to the hinterland 3) Energy networks
PILLAR 3: ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY	1) Reach Good Environmental Status (GES) by 2020, halt the loss of biodiversity and degradation of the ecosystem services and restore them (marine environment) 2) Transnational terrestrial habitats and biodiversity
PILLAR 4: SUSTAINABLE TOURISM	1) Diversified tourism offer (products and services) 2) Sustainable and responsible tourism management (innovation and quality)

Table 3. Examples of documented biological and economic effects of no-trawl zones

Location	Size of closure	Year of establishment	Type of management	Documented effects on fisheries	Effects on habitat/community	Economic effects	Reference
Georges Bank and in Southern New England	22,000 Km ²	1994	Trawl ban in the 3 areas and complementary fishery regulation in the waters outside the closed areas (reduced effort, trip limits and increased mesh size)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - After about 4 years of closure, increase of spawning-stock biomass of cod, haddock, yellowtail flounder and other components of groundfish community - Increase of total biomass of scallops - Reduction in fishing mortality of the stocks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Higher abundance of organisms, biomass and species diversity - More complex habitat in undisturbed areas, formed by higher presence of fragile epifauna organisms (tube-dwelling polychaetes, bryozoans, hydroids) 		[32,101]
Gulf of Castellammare (NW Sicily, coastal)	200 Km ²	1990	Trawl ban	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase in biomass of eleven target demersal species (9 finfish and 2 cephalopods) - Increase in total catches 	Not reported	Improved financial returns for the artisanal fishermen	[96,109]
Malacca Straits and the north coast of Java	Not reported	1980	Trawl ban	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase of demersal stocks 	Not reported	Increase in the employment of the small-scale fishery	[110]
Eastern Florida (Deep-water <i>Oculina</i> coral reefs)	315 Km ² passed to 1029 km ²	First ban in 1984; expansion in 2000	Ban of trawling, dredging, bottom longlines and anchoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fish populations have yet to recover from overfishing in the 1980s and 1990s 	Healthier coral communities in no-trawl areas compared to areas where fishing is still present		[111]
Isle of Man	≈ 2 Km ²	1989	Trawl ban	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The density of scallops above the minimum legal landing size (110 mm SL) was more than 7 times higher in the closed area than in the fished area by 2003 - Shift towards much older and larger scallops in the 			[112]

				closed area and, lower estimates of total mortality			
Great Barrier Reef Marine Park (GBRMP), Australia	≈ 33% of the area of the Marine Park (that covers a total area of about 344,400 Km ²)	2004	Trawling prohibited, large mesh gill netting allowed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase mean size and abundance of fish (e.g. coral trout and stripey seaperch (<i>Lutjanus carponotatus</i>)) and reef sharks - Provide ecosystem-wide larval supply - >20% predicted increase of biomass of seabed species 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decrease in the frequency of starfish outbreaks, with positive effects on coral populations - Increased abundance of corals 	Economic value of a healthy GBR to Australia is estimated to be about A\$5.5 billion annually; 53,800 full time jobs	[113]

Supplementary materials

Table S1. Very Large MPAs (VLMPPAs) established to date in the world.

Name	Type of protection	Type of protection	Extension (Km²)	Year of establishment	Aim of protection	Environment
Galapagos Marine Reserve	Marine Reserve	Galapagos Islands; eastern Pacific Ocean	133,000	1998	Created to protect biodiversity of the islands and surrounding waters	Underwater volcanoes, seamounts, reefs, underwater cliffs, wetlands, and lagoons
Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument	MPA	Northern Hawaiian Islands	362,073	2006	Created to protect natural resources and Native Hawaiian culture	Islands and shallow water environments
Benthic protection areas	Ban of bottom trawling	New Zealand	1,200,000	2007	Created to protect seabed habitats	17 sites hosting seamounts and hydrothermal vents
Phoenix Island Protected Area (PIPA)	MPA	Central Pacific Ocean	408,250	2008	Created to maintain PIPA as a pristine set of islands	8 atoll and low reef islands. It comprises ocean floor and water column (average of 4,000 m deep, and maximum at 6,147 m)
Marianas Trench	Marine National Monument (MPA)	East Philippines	246,608	2009	Created to protect deep see habitats	Trench bottom, 21 undersea volcanoes, waters and submerged lands around 3 of the northern Mariana Islands
US Pacific Remote	Marine	Pacific	210,000	2009	Created to	7 atolls and

Island	National Monument	Ocean			protect one wildlife and habitats	islands. It comprises coral reef, seabird, and shorebird
Sala y Gómez	No-take Marine Reserve	Chile	150,000	2010	Created to protect the undisturbed and relatively pristine area	The island and seamounts
Chagos Island	No-take marine reserve	Indian Ocean	640,000	2010	Created to safeguards diversity of marine life of the area	Deep water habitat and coral reefs
North-East Atlantic network of six high seas MPAs	Network of marine protected areas on the high seas	North-East Atlantic	286,200	2010	Created to establish an ecologically coherent network of well-managed MPAs	seamounts and sections of the Mid-Atlantic
South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands	MPA	Southern Ocean	1,070,000	2012	Created to protect marine life and allowing sustainable and regulated fisheries	Banks and troughs of South Georgia, bays, beaches and trench of the volcanic South Sandwich Islands
Coral Sea	No-take zone	Australia	989,842	2012	Created to protect a remote ocean ecosystem	Habitats for a range of species such as humpback whales, green turtles, white sharks, whale sharks and tuna. The East Australian Current forms here, which is a major pathway

						for mobile predators
Prince Edwards Islands	MPA	Southern Indian Ocean (South Africa territory)	180,000	Managed as a special nature reserve under since 1995. MPA since 2013	Created to protect offshore and deep ocean areas. It is the first South African offshore MPA	3 types of zones: A 12 nm sanctuary (no take) zone; 4 restricted zones, in which fishing effort is limited; A controlled zone, linking the 4 restricted areas.
Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument	Marine sanctuary	Central Pacific	1,271,500	2014	Create to protect biodiversity and to fight illegal fishing and seafood fraud	7 islands and reefs as well as the ocean around them

Table S2. List of Adriatic MPAs.

Name	Type of protection	Locality	Extension (Km ²)	Year of establishment	Aim of protection	Environment
Brijuni	National Park	Croatia	33.95 sea area: 26.51	1999	Created to protect the high biodiversity	Brujuni island and surrounding sea
Kornati	National Park	Croatia	217.00 sea area: 167.00	1980	Created to protect biodiversity	Highly preserved communities. <i>Posidonia oceanica</i> meadows
Lastovo Islands	Nature Park	Croatia	53.00 sea area: 143.12	2006	Created to preserve landscape and marine biodiversity	44 islands, islets, rocks and reefs
Limski Zaljev	Special Marine Reserve	Croatia	6.00	1970	Created to preserve biodiversity	
Malostonski Zaljev	Special Marine Reserve	Croatia	48.21	1983	Created to preserve biodiversity	
Mljet	National Park	Croatia	46.19 sea area: 15.19	1960	Created to preserve landscape and marine biodiversity	A portion of Mljet island. Forests and salt lakes
Telascica	Nature Park	Croatia	67.06 sea area: 39.72	1988	Created to preserve landscape and marine biodiversity	25 small bays and salt lakes
Datule Barbariga	Special Reserve	Croatia	4.00	1994	It is a paleontological important site	
Neretva Delta	Special Reserve	Croatia		1993	Ramsar Site, Wetland of International Importance	
Žut-Sit archipelago	Significant Seascape	Croatia	100.00	1967	It is a significant landscape	35 islands

Labin, Rabac and Prklog Bay	Significant Seascape	Croatia	13.47	1972	Create to preserve the richness and variety of landscape. Coastal zone is characterized by coves	
Prvić Island	Special Reserve	Croatia	70.00	1972	Create to preserve the rare flora and fauna	
Zrce	Significant Landscape	Croatia	3.59	1988	Create to protect the land and seascape	
Dolina Blaca	Significant Landscape	Croatia	2.3	1986	Create to protect the landscape	
Marine Cave Modra Spilja	Nature Monument	Croatia	0.0	1951		
Kanal Luka	Significant Seascape	Croatia	11.69	1974	Create to protect the landscape	from Sibenik bridge to the end of St. Anthony channel
Miramare	Nature Reserve	Italy	0.30	1986	Conservation of species	Rocky bottoms, pebbly and sandy up to 8 m depth; mud bottoms up to 18 m
Torre del Cerrano	MPA	Italy	37.00	2009	Protection and valorisation of environment	Sandy bottoms and small rocky outcrops
Tremiti Islands	Nature Reserve	Italy	14.66	1989	Created to preserve landscape and marine biodiversity	Tremiti archipelago and its boundaries area
Torre Guaceto	Nature Reserve	Italy	22.27	1991	Created to preserve landscape and	<i>Posidonia oceanica</i> meadows;

					marine biodiversity	coralligenous habitat
Cape Madona	Natural Monument	Slovenia	0.13	1990	Created to preserve landscape and marine biodiversity	Hard stone bottom, with scattered larger or smaller slabs of rock and monoliths
Debeli Rtič	Natural Monument	Slovenia	0.25	1991	Created to preserve landscape and marine biodiversity	Representative cliffs on Slovenian coast; salt meadow
Strunjan	Nature Reserve	Slovenia	4.30	2004	Created to preserve landscape and marine biodiversity	Representative cliffs on Slovenian coast and the only two lagoons of Slovenia
Karaburun Peninsula	National Marine Park	Albania	125.70	2010	Created to protect high biodiversity and natural habitats	Vlora Bay, the Peninsula of Karaburun and the Island of Sazani

Glossary

Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ): are composed by waters beyond the zone of national jurisdiction (i.e. high sea) and the seabed, ocean floor and subsoil thereof beyond the limit of national jurisdiction.

Bottom trawling: is an industrial, unselective fishing method where a net with heavy weights is towed across the seafloor. It is designed to catch species living on or near the bottom [1].

Fisheries Protection Zones (FPZ): areas in which fishery is strictly regulated. A FPZ usually is in the territorial waters of a country. Its aim is conservation and sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources.

Fishery Restricted Area (FRA): Mediterranean area with a spatio-temporal closure to specific gears (e.g. trawl, purse seines) with the aim to protect the area from fishing activities [2].

High seas: waters located outside the jurisdiction of states, or international waters.

Large Marine Protected Areas (LMPAs): areas of marine conservation of 1000s-10,000s Km² in surface area.

Marine Protected Areas (MPAs): the definition of a MPA varies in relation to its attributes and objectives. A MPA is a portion of ocean where government has regulated human activities (both extractive and non-extractive) within and outside of it. MPA regulations range from complete exclusion of human presence (no-take areas), to complex multiple use and zoning regulations [3]. MPAs can range from small village-level community-managed areas to large, zoned national parks.

Marine Management Areas (MMAs): are areas of the ocean, or a combination of land and ocean, where all human activities are managed toward common goals. MMAs are a form of ecosystem-based management, where all elements—biophysical, human, and institutional—of a particular system are considered together [4].

Marine Reserves (MR): are MPAs with strict no fishing policies that do not allow any take from the designated area.

Mid-water trawling: is a fishing method where a cone-shaped net is towed in mid-water. Pelagic species, mainly fish and cephalopods are the target species [5].

National Parks: typically large natural or near natural areas which main objective is protect functioning ecosystems (IUCN category II) [6].

Nature Reserve: a protected area which main objective is the protection of biodiversity and geological/geomorphological features (IUCN category Ia) [6].

Natural Monument: usually a small area established to protect specific natural features and related habitats and species (IUCN category III) [6].

Protected landscape: created to protect an important landscape/seascape and its related biodiversity (IUCN category V) [6]

Paper parks: a legally established protected area where experts believe current protection activities are insufficient to halt degradation [7]

Sanctuary: a general type of marine protected area (MPA). Ranging in size from less than one square mile to 137,792 square miles, each sanctuary may provide a secure habitat for endangered species, or may also protect shipwrecks and historic artifacts. Marine sanctuaries often have different zones, which allow different activities. There is a permit system to regulate all the activities, such as fishing or recreational water sports. Marine sanctuaries have also an educational aim and serve as outdoor classrooms for schoolchildren and laboratories for researchers

Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance (SPAMI): areas established to conserve biological diversity, specific ecosystems or endangered species peculiar of the Mediterranean Sea

Transboundary MPA: a region straddling international or subnational boundaries dedicated to the protection and maintenance of biological diversity, natural and cultural resource [8]

Very Large Marine Protected Areas (VLMPAs): areas of marine conservation larger than 100,000 Km²

References:

- [1] <http://www.fao.org/fishery/geartype/205/en>
- [2] Papadopoulou KN, Smith C, Giannoulaki M, Gristina M, Belluscio A, Criscoli A, et al. <http://www.ices.dk/news-and-events/symposia/Effects/Documents/Posters/Poster 7 - K -N Papadopoulou.pdf>
- [3] Wood L. Global marine protection targets: how S.M.A.R.T are they? *Environ Manage* 2011;47:525–35. doi:10.1007/s00267-011-9668-6.
- [4] Orbach M, Karrer L. Marine Managed Areas: What, Why, and Where. Science and Knowledge Division, Conservation International, Arlington, Virginia, USA. 2010;16pp. http://ian.umces.edu/pdfs/ian_report_280.pdf
- [5] <http://www.fao.org/fishery/geartype/309/en>
- [6] IUCN - Protected Area Categories http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/gpap_home/gpap_quality/gpap_pacategories/

- [7] International News and Analysis on Marine Protected Areas. 2011. Paper Parks: Why They Happen, and What Can Be Done to Change Them. Volume 2,11 <http://depts.washington.edu/mpanews/MPA20.pdf>
- [8] Mackelworth P. Peace parks and transboundary initiatives: implications for marine conservation and spatial planning. *Conserv Lett* 2012;5:90–8. doi:10.1111/j.1755-263X.2012.00223.x.